COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Command: Bridgeport	Division: Inland	Number: 820
Evaluated by: OSSII Vonna B	roughton	Date: 11-3-2009
Assisted by: Sgt. Ron Seldo	n	Date 11-3-2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION □ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Date: Commander's Signature Follow-up Required: Follow-up Inspection Yes No For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, Chapter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable Remarks: ⊠ Yes □ No \square N/A overtime being held responsible for paying a minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail? 2. Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated Remarks: □ N/A to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation □ No notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation? Are reimbursable special project codes being used Remarks: □ No □ N/A for all overtime associated with reimbursable special ✓ Yes 4. Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel Remarks: Overtime hrs earned is only ☐ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of reflected on CHP 71. Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects? 5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable Remarks: □ N/A overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other □ No than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time? 6. Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the Remarks. The original 415 is ⊠ No □ N/A CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on ☐ Yes documented as RDO. Not on the a regular day off? supplemental. 7. Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance -Remarks: Form 90 never completed ⊠ No □ N/A Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant ☐ Yes on a civil subpoena as of 11/3/09.

when overtime is associated for civil court?

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8.	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
+ 9.	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10	. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No occurrence in the Bridgeport Area
11	If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No occurrence in the Bridgeport Area.
12	Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Two employees over the maximum allotted hours of CTO.
14.	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Fifty percent of a 12 month period FLSA hours occurred.
15.	Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: A 415 showed an officer worked over 16.5 hrs in a 24 hr period.
16.	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Bridgeport	Inland	6
Inspected by:		Date 11/3/2009:
OSSII Vonna	Broughton	11/3/2009:

Page 1 of 3

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall I number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	Inspection of the second of th	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to doc	ard to:" enter the nex cument innovative pr	
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☑ Division Level ☐ Command I ☐ Executive Office Level	Level	Total hours expended inspection:	d on the	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa		IN L	
PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF				
Chapter Inspection:		NAMES OF THE PARTY		CAREST NEW YORK AND THE STATE OF THE STATE O
Inspector's Comments Rega	ding Ir	novative Practices	Complete September 100 persons, 00 - 10	
N/A Command Suggestions for S	tatewic	le Improvement:		
Inspector's Findings:				
The overall command overtime month period Monthly Attenda	nce Re	eport, the Area exp	erienced fifty pe	
Ensure completion is made of	the Fo	rm 90 civil court tri	al dated Septer	nber, 2009.
Make certain employees reduc	ce their	CTO balances to	reflect the capa	city allowed.
Compare beat schedules and	RDO to	o ensure FLSA doe	es not occur.	
Commandor's Possesser 7	Copour	r or Do Not Con	Our (Do Not Cons	ur shall decument besis for recognition
Commander & Response	Concu	I OI LI DO NOL COII	Cur (Do Not Cond	cur shall document basis for response)
a a				

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Bridgeport	Inland	6	
Inspected by:		Date	
OSSII Vonna	Broughton	11/3/2009:	

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Bridgeport	Inland	6
Inspected by:		Date
OSSII Vonna	Broughton	11/3/2009:

是我们是是这些方面是这种的人的对象。 第一种是是这种的人的是是一种的人的人们的人们的人们的人们是是一种人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人
Required Action
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline

In addressing the Monthly Attendance Report issue, I have put measures in place to ensure that the sergeants continuously monitor the 415's through-out the month so that FLSA issues do not occur in the future.

In addressing the absent Form 90, the employee has completed the document and the employee has been counseled on timely submission of documents.

In addressing the CTO balance issue, I sent out an e-mail to all the sergeants in the command and they have contained each employee who is either over on near the maximum balance allowed and these balances will be lowered by the end of 2009.

In addressing the beat schedules and RDO's issue, I have spoken to each sergeant and they are going to continuously monitor the beat schedules and RDO's with the FLSA period to ensure the Area complies with policy.

Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer.	1646-	11/24/09
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	INSPÉCTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
	Venna Broughte	11/12/07
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
<u></u> employee		In le lea
☐ Do not concur	1.1.1.	112 19 10]

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:		
Bridgeport	Inland	820		
Evaluated by:		Date:		
Sgt. Ron Seldon		11/3/2009		
Assisted by:		Date:		
Gretchen Mon	tgomery	11/3/2009		

applicable legal state discrepancies and/o Furthermore, the Ex-	ues, or deficiencie r deficiencies sha ceptions Docume	items with "Yes" or "No" answers es noted in the inspections shall ill be documented on an Excepti- ent shall include any follow-up an box shall be marked and only d	be comment ons Document d/or correct	ited on via th ent and addr ive action(s)	ne "Remark ressed to th) taken. If t	s" section. Additionally, such the next level of command. his form is used as a Follow-up
TYPE OF INSPECTION	N		Lead Inspe	ctor's Signatu	ıre:	
	Г	Command Level				
	_			45 1	16	
Executive Office		Voluntary Self-Inspection	Commande	er's Signature		Date:
Follow-up R		☐ Follow-up Inspection ₂	1/1	2/1	2)	11/24/09
Yes	⊠ No		10	1/100		11/29/09
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6			I d)	
		cked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation	
agency or a grant ap Office of T on traffic s the Depart	organization is olication to a ful raffic Safety (O afety goals clea	e aware that another proposing or has submitted adding agency other than the TS) that appears to focus arly within the jurisdiction of commander notify the missioner?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Did not occur at the Bridgeport Area
Plan, been for the pur engineerin implement	sought for trafi pose of conduct g studies, syste ations?	nrough the Highway Safety fic safety-related activities ting inventories, need and em development or program	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
the expens	ses associated by the National I	grant funding to assist with with the priority programs Highway Traffic Safety	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
4. Has the co	mmander ensu	red grant funds are not other programs or used for expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	through channe	ding grant funding els to Grants Management	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
6. Was GMU personnel	contacted to de	etermine the current ed for grant projects when oudgets?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provide by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	,	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at the Bridgeport Area
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with gran funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	nt X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GM prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	U ⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instruction contained in the associated project MOU?	s 🛮 🖾 Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	e Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not yet prepared for this period of inspection
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at the Bridgeport Area
16. Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget 	g Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at the Bridgeport Area

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at the Bridgeport Area
19	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at the Bridgeport Area
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No Motor Carrier programs in the Area
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has not occurred at the Bridgeport Area
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Bridgeport	Inland	6 Grants	
Inspected by:		Date:	
Sgt. Ron Seldon		11/3/2009	

Page 1 of 3

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typ number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspe shall be routed to and its due date. This docu improvement, identified deficiencies, correctiv	ection number. Under "Forwa Iment shall be utilized to doci	ird to:" enter the nex ument innovative pra	actices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level	Total hours expended inspection:	on the	Corrective Action Plan Included
☐ Executive Office Level	2 hours		Attachments Included
rollow-up Required.	ward to: Office of pections		
	Date: 12/3/2009		
Chapter Inspection:			
Inspector's Comments Regarding	Innovative Practices	HANGE HANGE HANGE HER	SAPARA TIAL A TAYAN AND SERVICE OF THE SAME OF THE SAM
N/A			
Command Suggestions for State	wide Improvement:		
Inspector's Findings:			it at a such as of group programs
The Bridgeport Area is a sma	all command that parti	cipates in a iim v in nearly all a	nited number of grant programs. areas of the Grant Management
inspection. According to the	Office Services Supe	rvisor, there ha	ive been occurrences where
additional grant hours were le	eft over at the end of t	he grant period	d. The Area will ensure all grant
project hours are appropriate	ly utilized in the future) .	
2			
Commander's Response: Con	ncur or Do Not Con	cur (Do Not Con	cur shall document basis for response)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Bridgeport	Inland	6 Grants
Inspected by: Sgt. Ron Seldon		Date: 11/3/2009

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command: Bridgeport	Division: Inland	Chapter: 6 Grants
Inspected by:		Date:
Sgt. Ron Seldon		11/3/2009

Required Action
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline

N/A

3		
Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer.	105/17	1119/09
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	INODEOTODIA GIONATURA	DATE
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE /
	1 fracco	11/6/01
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
employee	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
☐ Concur ☐ Do not concur	LV. A. I.	12/2/09
		2 /